

REMARKS

Claims 1, 9, and 16 are amended. Claims 1-18, as amended, remain in the application. No new matter is added by the amendments to the claims.

In the Final Office Action dated January 4, 2005 and in the Advisory Action dated April 12, 2005, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2 and 7-11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mink (4,678,393). The Examiner also rejected Claims 6 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mink in view of Tega et al (4,733,457).

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's grant of Applicant's telephonic interview request. The telephonic interview was held on May 4, 2005 between the Examiner and Applicant's attorney Michael Flynn. In the interview, Applicant's attorney restated the argument that the Mink patent does not show a swivel-arm having an end adapted to be mounted for swiveling movement and linear movement and thus does not anticipate Applicant's claimed invention.

The Examiner indicated in the Interview that he is interpreting the "adapted to be" claim language as a functional and not a structural limitation which, according to the Examiner, allows Mink '393 to read on the claim. The Examiner suggested amending the claims to remove the functional language and filing the claims formally to expedite the examination.

Applicant amended claims 1, 9, and 16 to remove the "adapted to be" language and clarify that the swivel-arm of the present invention includes an end mounted for both swiveling movement and linear movement. Neither the Mink patent nor any of the other cited references shows or suggests such a swivel-arm.

In view of the amendments to the claims and the above arguments, Applicant believes that the claims of record now define patentable subject matter over the art of record. Accordingly, an early Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

000132702/0102/629624-1

BEST AVAILABLE COPY